EXHIBIT B

Dockets.Justia.com

From: Chatterjee, I. Neel [mailto:nchatterjee@orrick.com]
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2008 8:39 PM
To: Michael Underhill
Cc: David Barrett; scott.mosko@finnegan.com; Sutton, Theresa A.; Cooper, Monte; Harlan Levy; Evan Parke
Subject: RE: Our Call

Dear Mike:

Please feel free to file your motion to stay. We intend to oppose it. However, I have had a chance to catch the client and discuss the matter with them. Our position is set forth below.

At this point, Facebook cannot assess what actions, if any, it will take with respect to ConnectU. The simple fact of the matter is that we all have a judgement before the Court to which we must comply. Facebook intends to seek release of the shares once the consideration is in the hands of the Special Master. When and if the shares are released to Facebook, it will review the evidence, the status of the business, and its rights and liabilities. As things currently stand, we have grave concerns that since signing the settlement agreement, the ConnectU Founders have incurred liabilities for the company and have engaged in major litigation and anticipate more. Despite requests for information, we have not been given it. As a result, only after reviewing the state of the ConnectU business will any decisions be made as to how to proceed with the business of ConnectU.

As a practical matter, we are perplexed by what appears to be your concern. Your concern appears to be that if ConnectU were in the hands of Facebook, an appeal would be mooted because ConnectU would no longer seek an appeal. While we have always believed ConnectU did not have standing to challenge the fraud allegations related to the Settlement Agreement in the first instance, the Settlement Agreement has four signatories. The three individuals decided not to challenge the settlement themselves. Whatever rights they have, they may pursue.

Should your client want a stay pending appeal, Facebook would consider agreeing to one if the three other signatories to the settlement agreement would agree to post a supersedeas bond of the value described by the Court at our last hearing.

Neel

From: Michael Underhill [mailto:munderhill@BSFLLP.com]
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2008 3:48 PM
To: Chatterjee, I. Neel
Cc: David Barrett; scott.mosko@finnegan.com; Sutton, Theresa A.; Cooper, Monte; Harlan Levy; Evan Parke
Subject: Re: Our Call

I did not hear you state that I had represented any conversations during any part of our conversation today. I will assume that you made this statements immediately before the call dropped. I was in a tunnel and could not hear what you were saying. I feel certain that your allegation is inaccurate. What conversations have I allegedly misrepresented? Why have you not previously raised this allegation to me?

In our conversation today, you stated that Facebook would not commit not to interfere with ConnectU's ability to pursue an appeal of Judge Ware's decision or to pursue a malpractice claim against Quinn, if it were to obtain ConnectU's stock. Rather, you stated that if Facebook had ConnectU's stock, it would then decide what it would do, but that it would be reasonable for me to assume that Facebook would act in its own interests. Your statements today are consistent with similar statements that you previously made to me.

If you think that I have misstated your position, please advise immediately. In addition, if Facebook is willing to make one or both of the commitments referenced in the first sentence of the preceeding paragraph, please let me know immediately. As I stated on the telephone, I am confirming Facebook's positions so that I can accurately represent them to the court in conjunction with our motion for a stay.

In our call, I also asked if Facebook would agree to keep ConnectU separate operationally, if it were turned over to Facebook. My concern is that the ConnectU shareholders get the company back when we prevail on appeal. I lost the cell phone connection when you were responding. Based on our prior conversation, I assume that your answer is "no.". If I am wrong, please let me know immediately. Again, I intend to represent this as Facebook's position in our motion for a stay unless you tell me that Facebook is willing to make this commitment.

I attempted twice to call you back minutes after I lost the cell phone connection but you did not pick up your phone. I expect that we will file our motion for a stay on monday unless Facebook is willing to make commitments by noon PDT on Monday that would obviate the need for that motion.

I hope that all goes well for your daughter.

Michael Underhill
BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
5301 Wisconsin Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20015
Tel 202.274.1120
Mobile 571.276.6021
Fax 202.237.6131
MUnderhill@BSFLLP.com

Sent using BlackBerry

From: Chatterjee, I. Neel
To: Michael Underhill
Cc: Sutton, Theresa A. ; scott.mosko@finnegan.com ; Cooper, Monte
Sent: Fri Jul 25 18:12:16 2008
Subject: Our Call
Mike:

Your phone dropped off during our conversation. I just want to be clear about our previous discussion.

You were asking me, on the fly, to commit to certain positions related to an anticipated motion to stay. I pointed out that I have felt you have, in the past, misrepresented our discussions both in Court and out of Court. As a result, and to make sure that the record is clear, I request that any requests you make related to any anticipated motions to stay be sent in writing. I will discuss the matter with my client and respond in writing. In this way, we can ensure the record is clear as to our respective positions. Alternatively, if you want to file a motion to stay, we will respond in due course.

Please feel free to initiate a meet and confer through an email with whatever questions you may have.

Thanks and have a good weekend,

Neel

"EMF <orrick.com>" made the following annotations.

==

IRS Circular 230 disclosure:
To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that any tax advice contained in this communication, unless expressly stated otherwise, was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding tax-related penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any tax-related matter(s) addressed herein.

==

NOTICE TO RECIPIENT: THIS E-MAIL IS MEANT FOR ONLY THE INTENDED RECIPIENT OF THE TRANSMISSION, AND MAY BE A COMMUNICATION PRIVILEGED BY LAW. IF YOU RECEIVED THIS E-MAIL IN ERROR, ANY REVIEW, USE, DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION, OR COPYING OF THIS E-MAIL IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY OF THE ERROR BY RETURN E-MAIL AND PLEASE DELETE THIS MESSAGE FROM YOUR SYSTEM. THANK YOU IN ADVANCE FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

For more information about Orrick, please visit

http://www.orrick.com/
===
==
=======
"EMF <orrick.com>" made the following annotations.

===

IRS Circular 230 disclosure:
To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that any tax advice contained in this communication, unless expressly stated otherwise, was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding tax-related penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any tax-related matter(s) addressed herein.

===

NOTICE TO RECIPIENT: THIS E-MAIL IS MEANT FOR ONLY THE INTENDED RECIPIENT OF THE TRANSMISSION, AND MAY BE A COMMUNICATION PRIVILEGED BY LAW. IF YOU RECEIVED THIS E-MAIL IN ERROR, ANY REVIEW, USE, DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION, OR COPYING OF THIS E-MAIL IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY OF THE ERROR BY RETURN E-MAIL AND PLEASE DELETE THIS MESSAGE FROM YOUR SYSTEM. THANK YOU IN ADVANCE FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

For more information about Orrick, please visit
http://www.orrick.com/
===
==
=======